



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                    | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR           | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/800,786                         | 03/15/2004  | Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia | G&C 30566.321-US-01 | 9206             |
| 55895                              | 7590        | 10/10/2008                     |                     |                  |
| GATES & COOPER LLP                 |             |                                | EXAMINER            |                  |
| HOWARD HUGHES CENTER               |             |                                | ORR, HENRY W        |                  |
| 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 |             |                                |                     |                  |
| LOS ANGELES, CA 90045              |             |                                | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                    |             |                                | 2176                |                  |
|                                    |             |                                | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                    |             |                                | 10/10/2008          | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/800,786

**Applicant(s)**

GARCIA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Henry Orr

**Art Unit**

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 7/23/2008.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims.

**Applicant's Response**

4. In Applicant's response dated 7/23/2008, applicant has amended the following:  
a) Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 4/23/2008 are withdrawn:

- a) Objection to claims 1, 6 and 11
- b) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claims 6-10

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,466,953 B1, in view of Workman et al. (hereinafter "Workman"), U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0236754 of record.**

Claim 1:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheets and Sheets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets and the Sheets, each of the Sheets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program"* (abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager displays a window that presents a logical structure for the Sheet Sets in a visual form comprising a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Set that shows the Subsets and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets, as well as the Sheets contained within the Subsets)**

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set contains subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, seat, handle bar, wheels). The Mountain Bike sheet set also contains sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters). Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Bonney teaches Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets (see Figures 2 and 5).

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing sheets.

However, Workman teaches an interface for publishing Sheets using a click operation (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager publishes a selected one of the Sheet Sets, including the Subsets and the Sheets of the selected Sheet Set, using a single user-selected operation.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing Sheets as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Claim 2:

Bonney teaches Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets (see Figures 2 and 5).

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing sheets.

However, Workman teaches a single operation of a click that is used to publish target drawings (see par. 51). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager publishes a selection of the Sheets within the published Sheet Set using the single user-selected operation.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface capable of receiving a single click operation as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Claim 5:

Bonney teaches a plot stamp with each Sheet (see col. 5 lines 35-45, *title block includes such information as entity name, device name and/or description, date, revision number etc.*).

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing sheets.

Therefore, Bonney fails to expressly teach including a plot stamp with each Sheet of the published Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches including a drawing title with each published Sheet (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 5; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager includes a plot stamp with each of the Sheets of the published Sheet Set.)**

Examiner interprets the plot stamp as described in the instant application as including the same information that a drawing title may include as taught by Workman

such as a drawing name. Therefore, if both the claimed plot stamp and drawing title as taught by Workman includes only a drawing name, then both are considered to be equivalent in functionality. Thus, in light of reasonable possibility of including the same information, the claimed plot stamp reads on the drawing title as taught by Workman.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set with a plot stamp as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly allowing designers to review and identify the drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 4-5, par. 51).

Claims 6, 7 and 10:

Claims 6, 7 and 10 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

Claims 11, 12, and 15:

Claims 11, 12, and 15 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

**7. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Workman as cited above, and in further view of Haddad, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111928 A1 of record.**

Claim 3:

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches applying publishing override properties for the Sheets.

However, Haddad teaches "Fig. 9C illustrates a graphical user interface screen for editing print settings for a selected document set etc...Parameters related to the print media are entered by the user in the sheet definitions fields 932" (see p. 7 par. 91).

**(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)** Examiner considers the print settings entered by the user for a printing work order to override any default publishing printing properties at a reprographic company that receive the printing work order for the drawing sheets. **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for print settings as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of properly applying a print specification to a drawing document in an efficient manner (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure



2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 4-5).

Claim 4:

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches allowing different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.

However, Haddad teaches *"one or more repro companies can be selected to produce the print work order"* (see p. 7-8 par. 93). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.)** Examiner considers the repro companies to be capable of printing the applicable documents or files (see Haddad; p. 4 par. 51). Therefore, the different repro companies listed in the graphical interface of Haddad's Figure 11 have their own individual output device, which allows a user to send print work orders associated with drawing sheets to the different repro companies having their own printing output device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for repro companies as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of efficiently producing and distributing printed documents (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 9-11).

Claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3 and 4 above.

Claims 13 and 14:

Claims 13 and 14 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 13 and 14 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### **Prior Art Rejections**

#### **Applicant argues that Bonney does not teach or suggest a Sheet Set Manager.**

Instead, the hierarchical relationship shown in Figure 2 of Bonney refers only to relationships between sheets, i.e., each icon 200-218 in Fig. 2 is a sheet. For example, icons 200, 206 and 214 are merely sheets. There is no way to interpret Fig. 2 of Bonney

as showing Sheet Sets containing both Subsets and Sheets, or Subsets containing Sheets, except by ignoring the definition of those terms. Certainly, Bonney itself never refers to Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets, as those terms are defined in Applicants' claims and specification (see Response pgs. 9-10).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claims recite a Sheet Set comprising a collection of Subsets and Sheets, each Subset comprises a collection of sheets.

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set comprises a collection of subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, Seat, Handle bar, Wheels). Each subset comprises a collection of sheets (e.g. Wheels is a subset which comprises titanium spokes sheet and off road tires sheet). The Mountain Bike sheet set also comprises a collection of sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters).

Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Therefore, Bonney does teach or suggest displaying Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets as recited in the claims.

**Applicant argues that Workman does not teach or suggest publishing a Sheet Set.** In particular, Workman does not teach a Sheet Set Manager that publishes a selected one of the Sheet Sets, including the Subsets and the Sheets of the selected Sheet Set, using a single user-selected operation. There is no recognition in Workman of the concept of publishing a selected Sheet Set, including the Subsets and the Sheets of the selected Sheet Set, in a user-selected operation, as those terms are defined in Applicants' claims and specification. Moreover, the only "one-click" function described in the cited portions of Workman relates to a user clicking on a given drawing title and then displaying a list of all the drawings that point to this drawing.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that the Workman reference is only being relied upon to teach the publishing aspect of the recited claims (e.g., publishing a sheet using a click operation). Bonney is relied upon to teach Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets. The claims recite a Sheet Set comprising a collection of Subsets and Sheets, each Subset comprises a collection of sheets. In other words, a sheet set is a group of sheets. Workman teaches publishing a sheet (see par. 51, *a designer can click on a given callout in a drawing. In response to this action, the link from the callout is traced to the target drawing and a rendition of the target drawing is published*). In light of Workman, each sheet within the Mountain Bike sheet set as illustrated in Bonney's

Figure 5 can be published when a designer clicks (i.e., single user-selected operation) on the callout in the drawing (i.e., sheet). If every sheet can be published, then any Sheet Set or Subset can be published because the Sheet Set and Subset comprises a collection of sheets.

Therefore, Bonney in view Workman does render obvious a Sheet Set Manager publishing a selected one of the Sheet Sets, including the Subsets and the Sheets of the Sheets of the selected Sheet Set, using a single user-selected operation.

**Dependent Claims 2, 7 and 12**

Applicant argues that neither Bonney nor Workman teaches or suggests the Sheet Set Manager publishes a selection of the Sheets within the published Sheet Set using the single user-selected operation (see Response p. 11).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner notes that the Workman reference is being relied upon to teach publishing a sheet using a click operation (see par. 51- *a designer can click on a given callout in a drawing. In response to this action, the link from the callout is traced to the target drawing and a rendition of the target drawing is published*). Examiner also notes that Bonney is being relied upon to teach Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets as illustrated in Figures 2 and 5.

Therefore, Bonney in view Workman does render obvious a Sheet Set Manager publishing a selection of the Sheets within the published Sheet Set using the single user-selected operation as recited in the claims.

**Dependent Claims 5, 10 and 15**

Applicant argues that neither Bonney nor Workman teaches or suggests "the Sheet Set Manager includes a plot stamp with each of the Sheets of the published Sheet Set". Applicant's specification defines a plot stamp as including a time stamp, drawing name, and user name of the individual who last modified the file (see Response pgs. 11).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's specification **does not set forth a definition for a plot stamp**, but merely describes the type of information that a plot stamp may include in respect to a published Sheet. For example, par. 119 of the instant application recites "***Ability to include a plot stamp with each published Sheet, automating the inclusion of time stamps, drawing name, user name of individual who last modified file, etc.***". Examiner interprets this passage as merely an example of the type of information included within a plot stamp. The plot stamp may include some of the examples or more of similar (i.e., "etc....") examples as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The plot stamp may include only one of the examples such as a

drawing a name. Therefore, in light of the specification, a plot stamp may only be a drawing name as supported in the specification.

Examiner relies on both Bonney and Workman as teaching or suggesting a plot stamp. Bonney teaches a plot stamp with each Sheet (see col. 5 lines 35-45, *title block includes such information as entity name, device name and/or description, date, revision number etc.*). Workman teaches including a drawing title with each published Sheet (see par. 5, par. 51).

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing sheets.

However, Workman teaches publishing sheets (see par. 51- *a designer can click on a given callout in a drawing. In response to this action, the link from the callout is traced to the target drawing and a rendition of the target drawing is published*).

Therefore, Bonney in view Workman does render obvious a Sheet Set Manager including a plot stamp with each of the Sheets of the published Sheet Set as recited in the claims.

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., plot stamp as including a **time stamp, drawing name, and user name of the individual who last modified the file**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

**Dependent Claims 3, 8 and 13**

Applicant argues that Bonney, Workman, and Haddad do not teach or suggest *"the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets."* (see Response pgs. 12-13).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches applying publishing override properties for the Sheets.

However, Haddad teaches "Fig. 9C illustrates a graphical user interface screen for editing print settings for a selected document set etc...Parameters related to the print media are entered by the user in the sheet definitions fields 932" (see p. 7 par. 91).

**(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)** Examiner considers the print settings entered by the user for a printing work order to override any default publishing printing properties at a reprographic company that receive the printing work order for the drawing sheets. **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)**



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for print settings as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of properly applying a print specification to a drawing document in an efficient manner (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 4-5).

**Dependent Claims 4, 9 and 14**

Applicant argues that Bonney, Workman and Haddad do not teach or suggest "the Sheet Set Manager allows different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices." (see Response pgs. 13-14)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches allowing different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.

However, Haddad teaches *"one or more repro companies can be selected to produce the print work order"* (see p. 7-8 par. 93). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.)** Examiner considers the repro companies to be capable of printing the applicable documents or files (see Haddard; p. 4 par. 51). Therefore, the

different repro companies listed in the graphical interface of Haddard's Figure 11 have their own individual output device, which allows a user to send print work orders associated with drawing sheets to the different repro companies having their own printing output device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for repro companies as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of efficiently producing and distributing printed documents (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 9-11).

For the foregoing reasons explained above, Examiner maintains all Prior Art Rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HO  
10/1/2008

/Rachna S Desai/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176